REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-9, 12, 17-18, 25-27 are pending. Claims 6, 10, 11, 13-16, 19-24, and 28-34 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 2, 5. 7-9, 12, 17-18, and 25-27 have been amended. In view of the amendments and the following remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's thoughtful reconsideration

Specification: The Examiner objected to the Specification asserting that the title is not descriptive. The Specification has been amended to address the Examiner's concerns.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102: Claims 1-9, 17, 19-20, 23-28 and 30 stand rejected as being anticipated by US Pub 2003/0065755 to Gunji. Claims 6, 19, 20, 23, 24, 28, and 30 have been cancelled and will not be addressed.

Claim 1 is directed to a system, that as amended, includes a server. That server is configured to:

1. maintain a database having a plurality of data records, each of the plurality of data records including a printer type identification, a plurality of substitute printer driver identifications associated with the printer type identification, and a compatibility rating associated with each substitute printer driver identifications;

2. communicate one of the plurality of data records via the network and receive a response identifying a selected one of the plurality of substitute printer driver identifications included in the communicated data record; and

3. cause a printer driver identified by the selected substitute printer driver identification to derive print ready data file for future print requests directed to a printer of the particular type identified by the printer type identification that is associated with the selected substitute printer driver identification.

Gunji describes an XML file containing of attribute information that specifies the attributes of printer driver provided by a server. That file identifies the address, corresponding type, the version, and the installation method, and the platform of the printer driver. See Gunji, abstract. Gunji's XML file does not include (a) a printer type identification, (b) a plurality of substitute printer driver identifications associated with the printer type identification, and (c) a compatibility rating associated with each substitute printer driver identifications. Thus, Gunji fails to teach or suggest a server configured to maintain a data base containing a plurality of such data records. Furthermore, Gunji mentions nothing of communicating one of the plurality of data records via the network and receiving a response identifying a selected one of the plurality of substitute printer driver identifications included in the communicated data record.

For at least these reasons, Claim 1 is patentable over Gunji as are Claims 2-5, 7-9, and 12 which depend from Claim 1.

Claim 17 is directed method implementation of Claim 1. For at least the same reasons Claim 1 is patentable over Gunji, so are Claim 17 and Claim 18 which depends from Claim 17.

Claim 25 is directed to an apparatus implementation of the system of Claim 1. For at least the same reasons Claim 1 is patentable over Gunji, so are Claim 25 and Claim 26 which depends from Claim 25.

Claim 27 is directed to a system that includes various means for implementing the method of Claim 17. Thus, for at least the same reasons Claims 1 and 17 are patentable over Gunji, so is Claim 27.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103: Claims 10-16, 18, 29, and 34 stand rejected as being obvious over Gunji alone or in view of another reference. Claims 10, 11, 13-16, 29, and 34 have been cancelled and will not be addressed.

S/N: 10/777,372
Case: 200300433-1
11
Response to Office Action

Claim 12 depends from Claim 1 and is patentable based at least in part on that dependency.

Claim 18 depends from Claim 17 and is patentable based at least in part on that dependency.

Conclusion: It is requested that all outstanding objections and rejections be withdrawn and that this application and all presently pending claims be allowed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Ward S. Foster

By /Jack H. McKinney/
Jack H. McKinney
Reg. No. 45,685

December 1, 2008

S/N: 10/777,372
Case: 200300433-1
Response to Office Action

12